



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/818,992	03/28/2001	Bradford H. Needham	P 0275014 P10427	9762

909 7590 02/13/2003

PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

LE, UYEN CHAU N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/818,992

Applicant(s)

NEEDHAM ET AL.

Examiner

Uyen-Chau N. Le

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Re claim 7, lines 1-2: Delete "capable of".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-2, 5-8, 10-13, 17 and 19-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tracy et al (US 5,979,757).

Re claims 1-2, 5-8, 10-13, 17 and 19-25: Tracy et al discloses a system/method a handheld recommendation assistant 70 comprising reading, by a barcode scanner 75 or a RFID tag reader (col. 3, lines 32-38), the product information of a product from a product tag (i.e., a UPC code/barcode tag or a RFID tag); retrieving consumer information through a connection (i.e., a connection network/LAN) (col. 9, lines 6-55) to a consumer information storage device (i.e., a database of a remote server or a local database stored on customer's identification card, which can be a smart card or a floppy disk (col. 13, lines 34+)); acquiring personal information of a user relevant to at least one aspect of the product through an interface on the handheld device (i.e., a touch sensitive display, which serves as an interface for inputting personal

Art Unit: 2876

information (e.g., password, etc.)), generating a product recommendation related to the product based on at least in part on the personal information and the consumer information (col. 9, lines 55+ and 60+), wherein generating a product recommendation comprising comparing the personal information and the consumer information to produce a comparison result, identifying at least one recommended product whose consumer information is consistent with the personal information, and recommending the at least one recommended product via the display 72 (i.e., price, product name, quantity, recipes, nutritional information and promotion, etc.), wherein the product recommendation is determined by a remote server, which is a central host (col. 14, lines 15+ and lines 60+ and col. 15, lines 34+). See figs. 1-4 and 7A-E; col. 3, lines 30+; col. 4, lines 1-42; col. 5, lines 36+; col. 6, lines 39+ and lines 57+; col. 7, line 34 through col. 11, line 28; and col. 13, lines 34+.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Art Unit: 2876

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 3-4, 9 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tracy et al in view of Suzuki (US 6,129,274). The teachings of Tracy et al have been discussed above.

Re claims 3-4, 9 and 13-16: Tracy et al has been discussed above but fails to teach or fairly suggest that the personal information including tailoring measurements, a color preference.

Suzuki teaches the above limitation with the personal information including tailoring measurements, a color preference (col. 4, lines 20+ and col. 10, lines 55+).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of into Suzuki the teachings of Tracy et al in order to provide the user/customer is provided with a complete recommendation of products that is fit to his/her needs (i.e., his/her desired size and color), and thus providing a more user friendly system. Furthermore, such modification would have been an obvious extension as taught by Tracy et al, and therefore an obvious expedient.

7. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tracy et al. The teachings of Tracy et al have been discussed above.

Re claim 18, Tracy et al has been discussed above but fails to teach or fairly suggest the step of storing the product information in a machine readable form in the product tag; and attaching the product tag containing the machine readable product information to the product.

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the step of storing the product information in a machine readable form in the product tag and attached the product tag to the product in order to provide

Art Unit: 2876

Tracy et al with a faster system wherein the product information can be retrieved readily one the product tag is read by the handheld device, and thus providing a time consuming system. Furthermore, such modification would have been an obvious extension as taught by Tracy et al, and therefore an obvious expedient.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The patents to Kumar (US 5,294,782); Ruppert et al (US 5,640,002); Lowell (US 4,115,870); Hacker et al (US 5,598,487); O'Hagan et al (US 5,821,513); Hacker et al (US 5,123,064); Kumar (US 5,386,106); Kumar (US 5,489,773); Gogulski (US 4,071,740); Ogasawara (US 6,123,259); Beach et al (US 6,084,528); Swartz et al (US 6,243,447); Swartz et al (US 5,923,735); Tracy et al (US 6,199,753); Gabos et al (US 2001/0,032,130); and Kosel (DE 19,718,904) are cited as of interest and illustrate a similar structure to a method and system for handheld shopping assistant.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen-Chau N. Le whose telephone number is 703-306-5588. The examiner can normally be reached on M,T, F: 6:00-6:30 and W&TH: 9:00-11:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL G LEE can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7724 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2876

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.


Uyen-Chau N. Le

February 10, 2003


Diane I. Lee
Primary Examiner
GAU 2876